

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,543	12/27/2000	Heikki Heikkila	14007	8973
759	90 03/13/2003			
Leopold Presser			EXAMINER	
Scully Scott Murphy & Presser 400 Garden City Plaza			WONG, LESLIE A	
Garden City, NY 11530				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1761	
			DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003	
				•

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		AS-1
	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/674,543	HEIKKILA ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leslie Wong	1761
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cov r sheet w	vith th correspondenc address
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	d to avoid abandonment of th ner: (1) a timely filed amendn Appeal (with appeal fee); or (his application. A proper reply to a nent which places the application in
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or	· b)]
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the m	nailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the ship above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	later than SIX MONTHS from the many WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH THE date on which the petition under of extension and the corresponding arrortened statutory period for reply original process.	iling date of the final rejection. HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee mount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 March 200</u> 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be ente	ered because:	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require	further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see I	Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appea	ıl by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without c	anceling a corresponding nu	mber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	,	
B. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)v canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitt	ed in a separate, timely filed amendment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ requapplication in condition for allowance because		een considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		SOLELY to issues which were newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amend explanation of how the new or amended clai 		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as fo	llows:	
Claim(s) allowed: None.		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-30 and 35-56</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None	<u>9</u> .	
B. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on $_$	is a) approved or b) [disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Sta	atement(s)(PTO-1449) Pape	г No(s)
10. Other:		Lecliewong
		Leslie Wong Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1761 ろんいつろ

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 009/674,543

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to claim 1 raises new issues that would require further consideration and search, and raises the issue of new matter. Specifically, it appears that the specification provides support for these amounts only for an aqueous solution (see claim 2 and page 6 of the specification).

Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claimed invention does not define over the prior art for the r asons of record (see Paper No. 9).